level, districts level, tehsil level/block level monitoring committees as on 30th June, 2002 to monitor the rural development programmes;

(b) the reasons for not constituting these monitoring committees; and

(c) the steps being taken by Government against the States not constituting the monitoring committees?

THE MINISTER OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRI SHANTA KUMAR): (a) The Ministry of Rural Development had advised all the States and Union Territories (excluding Delhi and Chandigarh) to constitute Vigilance and Monitoring Committees at the State, the district and the block levels. These States/Union Territories have reported to have constituted the Vigilance and Monitoring committees to monitor the progress of Rural Development Programmes at all the three levels.

(b) and (c) The questions do not arise.

Delay in clearing projects by CAPART

865. SHRI BACHANI LEKHRAJ: Will the Minister of RURAL DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that there is an inordinate delay in clearing the projects by the CAPART;

(b) if so, the reasons therefor;

(c) the number of proposals of various States pending with CAPART, State-wise; and

(d) the time by which these projects are likely to be cleared?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRI SUBHASH MAHARIA): (a) and (b) According to the laid down procedure of sanctioning of projects by the CAPART, a project proposal is sanctioned after desk appraisal and pre-funding evaluation during which the capability, credibility and community base of the orgsnisation and the feasibility of the proposal are evaluated by an independent monitor. If the evaluation report is positive, the proposal is recommended for sanction and placed before the concerned National Standing Committee/Regional Committee of the CAPART.

The entire process of obtaining documents, deputing evaluators, obtaining their reports, examining these documents and reports, etc. takes some time. Only after this process is completed, the proposal can be placed before the national Standing Committee/Regional Committee for consideration.

(c) A Statement indicating State-wise number of proposals pending with CAPART as on 30th June, 2002 is enclosed. (*See* below).

(d) The pending projects are placed before the concerned National Standing Committee/Regional Committee for consideration on the completion of all the formalities required such as desk appraisal of projects, pre-funding appraisal by the project evaluators, etc.

Statement

State-wise number of proposals pending with CAPART

Sl.No.	Name of State	No.
1.	Andhra Pradesh	421
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	1
3.	Assam	54
4.	Bihar	210
5.	Chhattisgarh	10
6.	Delhi	81
7.	Gujarat	1
8.	Goa	62
9.	Himachal Pradesh	110
10.	Haryana	65
11.	Jharkhand	13
12.	J & K	65
13.	Kerala	13
14.	Karnataka	65
15.	Madhya Pradesh	58
16.	Maharashtra	94
17.	Manipur	182
18.	Mizoram	85

Sl.No.	Name of State	No.
19.	Meghalaya	5
20.	Nagaland	3
21.	Orissa	26
22.	Punjab	154
23.	Rajasthan	10
24.	Tripura	70
25.	Tamil Nadu	146
26.	Uttar Pradesh	295
27.	Uttaranchal	68
28.	West Bengal	164
29.	Sikkim	Nil
30.	Lakshadweep	Nil
31.	Pondicherry	Nil
32.	Andaman & Nicobar	Nil
33.	Chandigarh	Nil
34.	Dadar & Nagar Haveli	Nil

Implementation of various schemes

866. SHRI V.V. RAGHAVAN:
SHRI J. CHITHARANJAN:

Will the Minister of TEXTILES be pleased to state:

(a) the steps taken by Government to implement the Plan Schemes "Integrated Apparel Park Schemes" and a "Scheme for Development of Central Infrastructure in Export Oriented Clusters";

(b) how far the implementation of the two said schemes have progressed; and

(c) how much International Capital after deservation of the Garment Sector has flown into this sector?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF TEXTILES (SHRI BASANGOUDA R. PATIL): (a) and (b) All State Governments/Union Territories have been requested to furnish project proposals in line with the guidelines of "Apparel Park for Exports Scheme" and "Textile Centre